

REMARKS

The information disclosure statement was found to be non-compliant with 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(3) for not containing a concise explanation of the relevance of each patent listed that is not in the English language. Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.121(d) of figures 1 to 6 were required labeling the figures as prior art. Formal drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.121(d) were required. The disclosure was objected to because of informalities. Claims 1 to 46 were objected to because of an informality.

Reconsideration of the application based on the following is respectfully requested

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement was found to be non-compliant with 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(3) for not containing a concise explanation of the relevance of each patent listed that is not in the English language. The information disclosure statement originally submitted, including one additional reference (AU on accompanying form PTO-1449) is being submitted herewith. Also submitted herewith is the Search Report of EP 1 202 218, a European Patent application corresponding to German Priority Document DE 100 41 292.0, and a brief translation of the search report classifying the references and concisely explaining the relevance of all foreign language references.

Full consideration of the information disclosure statement is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Disclosure

The disclosure was objected to because of informalities. Paragraph [0005] of the specification and the abstract have been amended to correct the informalities. Paragraph [0044] and [0045] have been amended for clarification. The abstract has been amended and is now of appropriate length.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 has been amended to correct the informality. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 to 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for having insufficient antecedent bases for some limitations. Claims 1, 5 to 8 and 15 and 16 have been amended to provide for antecedent bases for these limitations. Claims 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for containing unclear equations. Claims 35 and 36 were amended for clarification.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/934,723
Amdt. dated December 9, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 6, 2004



CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: _____

William C. Gehris

Reg. No. 38,156

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940